

Young and unionized workers before and during the crisis: Comparison of two surveys

IREC September 8-10, 2010 Oslo

Kuvvet Lordođlu*

M. Meryem Kurtulmuş Kirođlu**

Abstract

This paper examines the linkages between young workers and trade unions in Turkey by reference to two survey results done by United Metal Workers' Union in 2005 and by TAREM in 2009. There are some differences between these two surveys as to the universe, context, age-groups and sample size. However, the aim of comparing these two surveys is to evaluate the results of the surveys one of which was done before the economic crisis and the other that was done during the crisis. In this study, we compare the young workers' answers to the different questions and search how these answers show similarities and/or differences. Therefore, the aim of the study is to understand how the young workers answers and which variables are changed with the crisis and evaluate these results. Young workers in the context of these surveys had similar economic and education levels. Also they had similar sex ratios, social security coverage and practice of living with their families. Understanding the situation of young workers during the crisis through these similar properties is the main aim of this study.

*Professor, Marmara University, Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences, Department of Labour Economics and Industrial Relations, Kocaeli University Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences, Department of Labour Economics and Industrial Relations

** PhD, Marmara University, Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences, Department of Labour Economics and Industrial Relations

**Young and unionized workers before and during the crisis:
Comparison of two surveys**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction	3
2. Youth Labour and Status of the Youth in the Turkish Labour Market.....	5
3. Young Workers and Unions.....	9
4. Comparison of the Results of Two Surveys	10
4.1. Demographic Structure.....	12
4.2. Working Life.....	14
4.3. Unionization	16
4.4. Economic Crisis.....	18
5. Conclusion.....	21
References	23

1. Introduction

Labour force consist of the employed and the unemployed. The supply-side development of labour markets occurs in parallel with the changes in population growth rate and demographic structure. Over the recent years, Turkey's population growth rate has been declining, which results in shifts in the age composition of the population. The share of 15+ age group in total population increases. While the population in working age grows, the growth rate in persons not in labour force becomes higher than the labour force growth rate, and the labour force participation rate does not increase despite the growth in the population in working age (Table 1). The downward trend in LFPR indicates that the share of the unemployed+employed is declining. Infact while employment rate decreases, unemployment rate increases thus the reason of increases in LFPR in last two years is the increase in unemployment. In brief, only four out of every ten people in working age are employed or seek jobs as unemployed. The remaining six people fall outside of the labour market as housewives, students or pensioners.

Table 1: Labour force status

Years	Labour force participation rate %	Unemployment rate %	Non-agricultural unemployment rate %	Employment rate %	The ratio of under employed persons to labour force %
2009*	47,9	14	17,4	41,2	-
2008*	46,9	11	13,6	41,7	3,3
2007*	46,2	10,3	12,6	41,5	3
2006*	46,3	10,2	12,7	41,5	3,4
2005*	46,4	10,6	13,5	41,5	3,1
2004*	46,3	10,8	-	41,3	3,9
2003	48,3	10,5	-	43,2	4,8
2002	49,6	10,3	-	44,4	5,4
2001	49,8	8,4	-	45,6	6
2000	49,9	6,5	-	46,7	6,9

Source: Turkstat, Household Labour Force Statistics Database

* Revised by the new population projections.

Why is the proportion of persons not in labour force growing within the population in working age? First of all, longer periods of time are spent for education. "Could not find a job" is one of the reasons for longer periods of education and/or turn back towards education. The most substantial indicator for longer education periods is the decreasing share of those between the ages of 15-29 in employment (Table 2).

Table 2: Youth employment, thousand

Years	Total Employment	(15-24) age	(15-29) age	Rate of Youth employment to Total employment (15-24) age (%)	Rate of Youth employment to Total employment (15-29) age (%)
2009	21,277	3,328	6,656	16	31
2008	21,194	3,484	6,938	16	33
2007	20,738	3,492	6,873	17	33
2006	22,330	3,731	7,389	17	33
2005	22,046	3,800	7,460	17	34
2004	21,791	3,862	7,461	18	34
2003	21,147	3,777	7,322	18	35
2002	21,354	4,135	7,675	19	36
2001	21,524	4,460	7,966	21	37
2000	21,581	4,696	8,235	22	38

Source: Turkstat, Household Labour Force Statistics Database

On the other hand, low LFPR largely results from very low Female LFPR. Along with the rural-urban migration, more women participate in the “dealing with houseworks” category in urban areas, and thus women’s participation in labour force declines, which, in turn, decreases the overall labour force participation rate (LFPR). Therefore, gender tendencies in the labour market is one of the most significant results of declining agricultural employment. While one out of every four women participate in labour force countrywide, only one out of every five-six women participate in labour force in urban areas. Although the LFPRs of educated men and women are observed to be high, this rate is still higher in men compared to women.

As for the sectoral structure of employment, it is seen that agriculture-oriented structure is losing weight, but still continues. Agricultural employment constitutes $\frac{1}{4}$ of total employment. While the industrial employment does not expand, employment in Service sector has reached 55 percent of overall employment. As mentioned before declining share of agricultural employment is an important factor in the constant decrease in the labour force participation rate.

When we look at unemployment we can see that there is a structural unemployment problem for years but also unemployment rate increases in the crisis periods. After the 2008 crisis, the unemployment rate has reached 14 percent in 2009. Non-agricultural unemployment rate has reached 17.4 percent. The unemployment rate for women is generally lower than men's. However, the unemployment rate is higher for women in urban areas while it is higher for men in rural areas. In general, the unemployment rate in rural areas less than the rate in urban areas. The major reason for this phenomenon is that unpaid family labor is one of the most common forms of employment in rural areas. The rate of unemployment is higher in educated men compared to women (<http://www.tuik.gov.tr/>).

In this briefly mentioned general structure of the labour market as is known, 35% of the active population is composed of youth labour in Turkey. We can define youth labour as the active population in the (15-29) age group when we add the people who joined into the labour force lately due to the increases in education period. Especially after the 2001 crisis, rising unemployment rates have had striking impacts on the young people in the labor market. Young people who join the active population lately and cannot be employed are added to the reserve army of industry. Youth unemployment rates are therefore much higher than the

average rate of unemployment in general. Along with the 2008 crisis, youth unemployment rates have increased further. In fact, it may be said to be higher than the official statistics (See Table A4). The unionization rates are also low among young people who face with unemployment to a great extent and make up nearly half of wage workers and per diem employees who constitute 35% of the active population. However, data are not available concerning unionized youth, either. This study compares two recent surveys relating to unionized young workers.

Thus, this paper, examines the linkages between young workers and trade unions in Turkey by reference to two surveys, and evaluates the results of these two surveys, one of which was done by the United Metal Workers' Union in 2005 and the other by TAREM in 2009. There are some differences between these two surveys as universe, context, age-groups and sample size. However, the aim of comparing these two surveys is to evaluate the results of the surveys one of which was done before the economic crisis and the other was done during the crisis. In this study, we compare the young workers' answers to the different questions and search how these answers show similarities and/or differences. Therefore, the aim of the study is to understand how the young workers answers and which variables are changed with the crisis and evaluate these results. Young workers in the context of these surveys had similar economic and education level. Also they had similar sex ratios, social security coverage and practice of living together with their families. Through these similar properties to understand, the situation of young workers during the crisis is the main aim of this study.

2. Youth Labour and Status of the Youth in the Turkish Labour Market

The concept of youth in general may vary depending on the cultural, political and economic factors of countries. The generally accepted age range defines youth as between the ages of 15-24. According to the International Labour Organization data, apart from the 15-24 age range, youth is defined to be between the ages of 18-24 in Brazil, 14-24 in Jamaica and 16-24 in the US (ILO, 2010:52). According to ILO sources, young workers more commonly face with lower wages, less or none social security, short-term and often informal jobs at heavy working hours. However, it is rather difficult to reach indicators to support this observation (ILO, 2005: 78). The survey conducted by United Metal Workers' Union (2005) determines the age group of young workers between 18-26 while the survey by TAREM (2009) determines the age group as 15-29 on such grounds as increasing periods of education and low LFPRs among youth¹.

As seen in Table 3, there is a downward trend in youth labour force participation rates worldwide in the past decade. Though the downward trend may vary by country and region, increasing periods of education can be an essential factor. On the other hand, youth labour force participation rates are lower in certain regions (Middle Eastern countries, North Africa, Eastern European countries apart from the EU) compared to others. In terms of regions and countries where labour force participation rate is high, it is observed that young people join the labour force by 50 percent and above. In general, youth unemployment rate is nearly three

¹ In the survey conducted by Tarem, the rate of those between the ages of 15-19 is very low (%2) among the unionized workers. Thus, the difference between age groups is not an obstacle for comparison in this sense. Yet, those between the ages of 25-29 constitute 73 percent of the unionized young workers. Turkstat defines youth labour as active population in the 15-24 age group. Besides, Turkstat has taken the 15-34 age range as the basis within the scope of the survey on youth's transition to labour market in 2009 (<http://www.turkstat.gov.tr>).

times as high as the adult unemployment rates, which shows that young people constitute 41% of the unemployed worldwide. (See Table 4)

Table 3: Labour force participation rates for youth, world and regions (%)

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009*
World	54.4	53.8	53.3	52.8	52.3	52.0	51.8	51.5	51.1	50.8	51.0
Developed Economies and European Union	52.8	53.1	52.5	51.8	50.9	50.6	50.8	51.0	50.7	50.7	50.3
Central and South-Eastern Europe (non-EU) and CIS	43.6	42.4	42.1	41.7	40.8	40.9	41.0	41.0	41.5	41.4	41.6
East Asia	68.6	67.2	65.8	64.4	62.9	61.7	60.6	59.7	58.9	58.6	59.2
South East Asia and The Pacific	56.9	55.8	56.3	55.4	54.8	54.4	53.8	52.7	52.0	51.4	51.6
South Asia	48.4	48.0	47.8	47.7	47.5	47.3	47.2	47.2	46.8	46.6	46.6
Latin America and The Caribbean	54.7	54.2	53.5	53.4	53.0	53.5	53.3	53.3	53.3	52.8	52.3
Middle East	36.9	36.9	37.0	37.1	37.2	37.3	37.5	37.0	36.5	35.9	36.4
North Africa	39.6	39.4	38.8	38.7	38.9	39.1	38.9	38.1	37.2	37.1	38.0
Sub-Saharan Africa	57.7	57.8	57.8	57.8	57.7	57.6	57.6	57.5	57.5	57.4	57.5

Source: ILO Global Employment Trends 2010 p:50

Table 4: Unemployment rate for youth, world and regions (%)

	1999	2000	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009*
World	12.6	12.5	13.0	13.0	12.4	11.8	12.1	13.4
Developed Economies and European Union	13.9	13.2	14.4	14.1	13.0	12.2	13.1	17.7
Central and South-Eastern Europe (non-EU) and CIS	22.7	19.9	19.6	19.1	18.5	17.5	17.1	21.5
East Asia	9.2	8.9	8.5	8.4	8.2	7.8	8.7	9.0
South East Asia and The Pacific	13.1	13.2	17.0	17.9	17.2	14.9	14.4	15.3
South Asia	9.8	10.2	10.3	10.4	10.0	9.9	9.9	10.7
Latin America and The Caribbean	15.6	15.5	16.5	16.1	15.1	14.1	14.3	16.6
Middle East	20.5	21.1	20.8	22.6	21.6	21.4	21.7	22.3
North Africa	27.3	29.9	27.2	26.8	24.2	23.6	23.5	22.3
Sub-Saharan Africa	12.6	12.6	12.6	12.4	12.4	12.3	12.3	12.6

Source: ILO Global Employment Trends 2010 p:47

This study deals with young and unionized workers. In this sense, it is also necessary to look at the situation of the youth in labour market. Turkey's labour market is made up by those between the ages of 15-24 by 18%. This rate goes higher up when we add those between the ages of 25-29, which results in 35% of overall labour force consisting of youth labour between the ages of 15-29 (2008). Yet, considering the place of young workers in employment in terms of their positions at work, it is seen that young workers (wage and per diem + unpaid family labour) nearly comprise 50 percent of the overall employment (wage and per diem + unpaid family labour). Between 2000 and 2009, the estimate of young workers between the ages of 15-29 changes between 47-38 %. Especially in recent years, the rate of decline in unpaid family labour has been above the increase in paid labour (TurkStat Labour Force Database).

As can be followed in Table 5, there has not been a significant change in LFPR recently. The youth (15-24) LFPR develops in a similar way as the overall LFPR in Turkey. Though there has been a slight declining tendency in years, LFPR in this age group varies between 36-38% over the past decade. The fact that LFPRs for all age groups rank at lowest levels among the OECD countries is associated with the labour market dynamics in Turkey.

Table 5: Labour force status of "15-24 age group" (2004-2010) thousand

Years		Population between age 15 and 24	Labour force	Emp loyed	Unemp- loyed	Labour force participa- tion rate (%)	Unemp- loyment rate (%)	Non-agri cultural Un employ- ment rate (%)	Employ- ment rate (%)	Not in labour force
2004	ANNUAL (*)	11,840	4,474	3,554	919	37.8	20.6	26.6	30.0	7,366
2005	ANNUAL (*)	11,757	4,436	3,554	881	37.7	19.9	24.2	30.2	7,321
2006	ANNUAL (*)	11,670	4,365	3,533	832	37.4	19.1	22.5	30.3	7,305
2007	ANNUAL (*)	11,583	4,364	3,493	871	37.7	20.0	23.3	30.2	7,218
2008	ANNUAL	11,490	4,381	3,484	897	38.1	20.5	24.2	30.3	7,109
2009	ANNUAL	11,513	4,454	3,328	1,126	38.7	25.3	29.8	28.9	7,059
2010	JANUARY	11,535	4,245	3,146	1,099	36.8	25.9	29.3	27.3	7,290
	FEBRUARY	11,537	4,201	3,129	1,071	36.4	25.5	29.2	27.1	7,336
	MARCH	11,539	4,244	3,202	1,042	36.8	24.6	28.5	27.8	7,294

Source: TURKSTAT, The results of Household Labour Force Survey

Note 1) Total figures may not be exact due to the rounding of the numbers,

2) Sample size is too small for reliable estimates for figures less than two thousand persons in each cell.

(*) Revised by the new population projections.

Considering their situation within employment, the share of employees particularly between the ages of 15-24 in overall employment tends to decline after 2000. Due to the increasing periods of education of the youth in this age group and thus being excluded from the labour market, the employment rate in the 15-24 age group decreases. This decrease is essentially observed to be in 15-19 age group. The share of 15-19 age group in employment decreased from 9% to 6% since 2000 up till now. The fact that the shares of young workers between the ages of 19-24 and 25-29 in employment did not increase after 2000 reveals that the essential change took place in 15-19 age group.

Nearly 2/3 of young people in 15-24 age group live in urban areas with the rest living in rural areas. There is a similar distribution according to the labour force and the employed. Nearly 65% of the employed in this age group are employed in urban areas.

From the gender perspective, the most significant difference revealed by the 15-24 age group is that female labour force participation is much higher in rural areas compared to urban areas. This situation is likewise in age groups other than 15-24. However, women's LFPR declines in rural areas between 2004-2009 while it rises in urban areas.

Unemployment is one of the main problems encountered by the youth population in labour market. Those who are about to enter the business world for the first time are more vulnerable than those who have entered previously. Therefore, it is common for youth unemployment rates to be higher than adult unemployment rates in almost every country (Martin, 2009:5). Relatively high youth unemployment rates in many industrialised countries have been continuing for long years despite significant varieties among the countries. This situation is similar in Turkey, too. Youth unemployment rates are higher than adult unemployment rates. This is one of the most important characteristics of Turkish labour markets. The fact that young people are more adversely affected from the crisis may be associated with this situation. Especially in times of crisis, new comer young workers with low seniority are given selected firstly to be dismissed. General unemployment rates of those between the ages of 15-24 increased with the impact of 2001 and 2008 crises. The average unemployment rate at this age group rose from 20% in 2005 to 26% in 2009. The high number of first-job-seekers also influences these high rates of unemployment. Other than this, the share of 15-24 age group is rather significant among the entire unemployed.

While the level of education has improved in Turkey over recent years, the unemployment rates also rise among the young people with higher education. Unemployment rate of young people with higher education is above that of the primary school graduates (Sönmez, 2010: 87).

Young people are generally obliged to accept low wages, poor working conditions and unsecured working when they can find jobs. They are employed in risky jobs like as in the case of denim sandblasting workers, or in call centers with high mobilization and low wages. In general, youth employment rises in short-term, unsecured and part-time jobs. As for the sectors of employment for 15-24 age group, there is high representation in areas like textile and hotels-restaurants where unqualified labour is needed. These are also low-wage sectors benefiting from temporary and seasonal labour force. On the other hand, there is low representation of 15-24 age group is in transportation, communication and social services sectors (Yentürk and Başlevent, 2007).

Young workers entering the working life are employed under low wages, poor working conditions and without employment security. Under these conditions, the rate of unionization is very low among young workers. Young people, who are raised apolitically particularly after 1980, do not have any experience of organizing before working life. Therefore, it may be said that youth have an unfavourable stance towards unions after 1980. Consequently, since 1980s, young workers' stance towards unions has included non-political motifs totally concerned with daily economic interests. Besides, legal amendments after 1980 constitute obstacles in front of organizing. Furthermore, dismissal of unionized workers for union-related reasons spreads the fear of being dismissed and thus hinders organizing². Apart from these, malfunctioning union democracy drives young workers away from the union managements.

² For crisis of Trade unions in Turkey see Müftüoğlu (2001; 2007), Sazak (2007) and Yücesan-Özdemir (2009).

3. Young Workers and Unions

In a survey conducted among young and adult workers in the US, Canada and the UK, it is observed that there has been significant decrease in the rate of young unionized workers compared to adult workers between 1990-2000 (Bryson et al., 2005:156). Another recent review of unionization among young people in Western Europe also showed that rates of unionization among young people are lower than among adults and that the rate of unionization for young people is declining more steeply than among old workers (Serrano Pascual and Waddington, 2000 cited by Waddington and Cerr, 2002: 298). It is seen that the rate of unionized workers decreased mostly in Britain (Bryson et al., 2005:156).

There are studies concerning the reasons why youth unionization rates decline faster. These studies deal with various obstacles in front of youth unionization. According to Waddington and Cerr (2002: 298) there is little ideological opposition to trade unionism among young people. The impact of employer resistance to unions and union inefficiencies are more influential in accounting for the failure to recruit more young workers. Furthermore, rising opposition to unions from employers, particularly at small sites, during the 1980s is likely to have accelerated the decline in the unionisation of young workers (Gallie and Rose, 1996 cited by Waddington and Cerr, 2002: 301). So the core argument is that employer resistance to unionisation underpins the declining rate of membership among young workers, rather than any wide-ranging shift in attitudes. Union inefficiencies and shifts in the composition of employment also contribute to the low level of unionisation among young workers (Waddington and Cerr, 2002: 301).

A variety of measures have been introduced by trade unions to stem the sharp decline in unionisation among young people. Reduced subscription rates for young trade unionists are now almost universal. Many unions have established youth or student sections to encourage higher rates of participation in union affairs and to foster contributions from young members on the development of union policy. The combined scope of these measures indicates the priority attached by unions to the recruitment of young people, although, there is no apparent slowing in the rate of decline of unionisation among young people (Waddington and Cerr, 2002: 299).

In Turkey, we do not have a quantitative database concerning youth representation in unions. Therefore, we do not know what proportion of union workers are comprised of the 15-29 age group. We only have member identity researches conducted by unions and related information.³ Therefore, we will just give examples in this section to mention youth attitudes towards unions. Consequently, in this study, we will compare and contrast the results of two surveys conducted about unionized young workers to reveal the general characteristics, working life related information and views about unions, and since one of the surveys was conducted during the crisis, to reveal how they were affected from the crisis. It is assumed that youth unionization rates are low in Turkey as in other countries. Obstacles in front of unionization, especially after 1980, decrease overall unionization rates, and impede youth unionization in particular. The most important handicap to unionization is observed to be the

³ Disk-Ar "Working class in Turkey in 1990s" 1992, Disk-Ar, "Identity of Industrial Workers", 1993, Kristal-İş Glass Industry Workers, 1990, Kristal – İş Union, Glass Industry Workers Survey-2, 1992, United Metal Workers Union, Member identity survey, 1995, United Metal Workers Union, Member identity survey 99, 1999, United Metal Workers Union, "Young Worker Survey," 2005, United Metal Workers Union, "Member identity survey" 2008, TAREM "Young Worker Profile Survey" 2009, Türk-İş Youth Committee Organized Young Worker Profile (no date).

fear of dismissal that is the result of the repressive attitude of employers against unionization and unionized workers.

Young people constitute an important part of the member base of unions in Turkey. Though results vary in different surveys, unionized young workers constitute nearly 25 percent.⁴ Unions' youth-related policies are also insufficient. In almost all member identity surveys conducted by both DİSK (Confederation of Progressive Trade Unions of Turkey) and affiliated unions and also Türk-İş (Confederation of Turkish Trade Unions), a great majority of union members find the union activities toward members insufficient. DİSK's self-criticism revealed that the office did not work enough towards youth up to date (2006). In Türk-İş youth workers profile survey, when it was asked whether youth representation is in unions, around 60 percent of interviewees answered No. In the same survey, more than 50 percent of participants stated that youth underrepresentation in unions adversely affected the stance towards unions. This situation reflects the negative attitude of even unionized workers towards their unions.

On the other hand, there are organizing attempts of some young workers in certain areas in Turkey recently. Though insufficient, unions have recently started conducting surveys and activities addressing at least their own young members⁵. Besides, not only for young workers, but a union for students has been formed with active support of DİSK (Genç-Sen) (see <http://www.gencsen.org/>).

On the other side, young workers are desirous of unionization, a demand which cannot be satisfied by the unions efficiently. For example the number of young people employed in call centers has increased significantly over the recent years. Young people working with a flexible schedule in service sectors have highly serious working problems. These problems can be summarized as low wage and long hours of working which are most intense at call centers. When these call center employees wanted to be involved in a union organization, they formed their own association firstly due to unions' lack of attention.⁶ Also against the increasing subcontracting, subcontracted young workers organized in an association called "association of solidarity and assistance for subcontracted workers" not in a trade union which shows that young workers' lack of confidence in trade unions.⁷ In this context, organizing efforts of young employees especially in service sectors, such as in IBM Turkey office and Bilgi University, and of research assistants due to unsecured working conditions in public universities turn out to be the union quests that draw attention lately.

4. Comparison of the Results of Two Surveys

As mentioned before, the purpose of this study is to compare two different surveys conducted with young and unionized workers at different times in Turkey and to highlight the differences and similarities revealed in this comparison. In Turkey, data about the share of young workers in unionized workers or the rate of unionized workers by age can only be

⁴ Although this rate has limited representative quality for all unionized workers, twentyfive percent share seems to be the most applicable one among the varying quantitative data by year in member identity surveys.

⁵ In 2010, the third Global Young Workers Meeting was held under cooperation of Social Research and Education Center (TAREM) and unions affiliated to DİSK and TÜRK-İŞ (<http://dunyagenciscibusmasi.org/>).

⁶ Call Center Employees Association (2009) www.gercegecagrimerkezi.org. The popular movie "Love in Another Language" also draws attention to the problems of workers in this field.

⁷ Interview with Güneş Cengiz, president of "association of solidarity and assistance for subcontracted workers" (5.09.2010).

obtained from worker profile surveys or directly from surveys on unionized young workers, and the number of these studies is limited.

The focus of this study is young workers, and in particular, unionized young workers. The population in working age is comprised of the 15-24 age group by 22.6% and 15-29 age group by 35.1%. Out of 11 million 491 thousand people who make up the 15-24 age group, 3 million 484 thousand people are employed.

As known, crisis experiences of capitalist economies cause problems not only for capital, but also for labour. The scope of influence of these problems is even larger and more comprehensive for the working class. Especially being deprived of the ability of selling labour force as their only means of income has vital implications for the working class.

In the literature, it is noted that youth unionization rates decline faster than that of adults (Waddington and Cerr, 2002: 298). Besides, it was noted that youth unionization rates are low in Turkey. Yet, according to the United Metal Workers' Union, the Union's member profile is getting younger. It is stated that their members at newly organized work places mostly consist of young workers (UM 2005:2)⁸. So, RE1 survey conducted by United Metal deals with member workers at and under the age of 26 in demographic, economic, social and political aspects (UM 2005:3). The United Metal Workers' Union affiliated to the Confederation of Progressive Trade Unions (DİSK) is organized in metal sector mostly in metropolitan industrial cities among workers in private sector enterprises⁹. The survey was conducted in 2005 in 26 plants where young members were employed to a high degree, and at the end of the interviews, preliminary evaluations were performed on the interviews to analyze 156 interviews. In RE2 survey conducted by TAREM, it was aimed to understand the demographic profiles and life styles of young workers, determine their political and union tendencies, and find out their situation in front of the economic crisis. Covering 15-29 age group, TAREM's survey conducted 1108 interviews in 12 sectors in 13 provinces between May-June 2009. Out of 1108, 199 interviews were made with unionized young workers.¹⁰

There are certain problems in the comparison of these two surveys. The survey of United Metal covers only young workers who are union members while TAREM's survey includes unionized and non-unionized young workers. The number of young and unionized workers is close in both surveys. Therefore, the only thing that can be taken as common in both studies is that they cover young and unionized workers. Hence, as mentioned before, the comparison will be limited to the context of unionized young workers in this study.

Another important handicap is that the surveys cover different age groups and were conducted in different sectors. The UM's survey deals with the 18-26 age group and that of TAREM deal with the 15-29 age group. Another difference is that the UM's survey only covers young workers in metal sector while in TAREM's survey, only 18 percent of young workers are employed in metal sector. (See Table 6)

⁸ For instance, the Union of United Metal Workers conducted three member identity surveys in 1995, 1999 and 2008. According to the survey conducted in 2008, 9% of 806 members participating in the survey are at and under the age of 25 and 26% are between 26-30.

⁹ Therefore, Istanbul-Kocaeli industrial zone and around have a major place within the research sample, and Kocaeli is important in terms of number of members, but did not participate in the survey, which can be regarded as a deficiency of the survey.

¹⁰ One of these surveys conducted by United Metal Workers covers the unionized workers under the age of 26. In the explanations from now on, the first survey will be referred to as RE1. The other survey conducted by TAREM covers workers under the age of 29. The second survey will be referred to as RE2 from now on.

Table 6: RE2-Main economic activity of the firm/enterprise

BASE - Total Respondents	199
	%
Agriculture	4
Metal	18
Food	11
Petroleum-Chemicals	13
Textile	12
Manufacture	53
Municipal Administration	16
Office-Commerce	3
Education	-
Communication-Transportation	3
Health	7
Hotel -Accommodation	15
Service	43
Construction	-
	100

4.1. Demographic Structure

Gender

In RE1, 92,3 percent of United Metal's young workers are men while only 7,7 percent are women.¹¹ The share of young female workers is low because United Metal is organized in metal sector where male workers make up the vast majority. In RE2 which covers different sectors, 75% of 199 unionized workers are men and 25% are women¹². Where does this difference come from? Tarem's survey covers health, service and public sectors, as well, where female employment is more common compared to metal sector; thus, the high rate of female unionization revealed in Tarem's survey results from the presence of sectors where female employment is higher. Female unionization is lower than male unionization both in public and private sectors. Yet, the rate of women among the unionized is higher in public than in private sector (ÇSGB, 2008; Toksöz and Erdoğan, 1998).

Age

In RE2, 15-29 age group is taken as young workers while in RE1, 18-26 age group is taken. In RE1, nearly half of the members are 25-26 years old. The other half is at 18-24 age group. In RE2, 27% of them are in 15-24 age group and 73% in 25-29 age group. Generally speaking, this can be explained with low rate of unionization among young workers in 15-24 age group. In 25-29 age group, both LFPR and unionization rate is higher than 15-24 age group. The difference between 2005-2009 is considered to be arising from higher LFPR in this age group rather than a difference resulting from the crisis (<http://www.turkstat.gov.tr>).

¹¹ In the "member identity survey" conducted by UM in 2008, 3.6% of the interviewees are women. In this survey, 9% of members are at and under the age of 25. 26% of them are between the ages of 26-30 (UM, 2008).

¹² In the survey conducted by TAREM, 27% of total interviewees are women while 19% of those working in industry are women.

Table 7: Unionized Workers by Age

RE1-Age		RE2-Age	
BASE - Total Respondents	156	BASE - Total Respondents	199
	%		%
		15-19	2
18-24	50	20-24	25
25-26	50	25-29	73
	100		100

(a)

(b)

Education

The unionization of those with higher education may be thought to be connected with their ability to access to insured and registered jobs. In general, the level of education is low among youth in Turkey. Also especially among the youth who do not go to school, the rate of those who are not included in labour force is high (Yentürk and Başlevent 2007).

As for the educational background, three fourth of the members in RE1 are high school graduates, and the rate of unionized young workers with education level is high school and above reaches 80 percent when two-year university degree holders and university graduates are also added. The rate of primary school graduates is only 19,3 percent. 45,5 percent of young members are vocational high school graduates¹³. In RE2, 48% of the union members are high school graduates, 24% are two-year university degree holders and 9% are university graduates. The rate of primary school graduates is 18%. When the results of two studies are evaluated together, it is seen that the education level of nearly 80% of unionized young workers is high school and above.

It is seen that educated unionized workers are highly represented in both surveys. There is quite a high rate of university graduates in RE2. It can be said that the unionization rate is higher among educated young workers. However, we do not suppose that this situation results from a more favourable stance towards union as the level of education gets higher. As the level of education gets higher, so does participation in labour force. LFPR is higher among young workers with higher education. As the period of time spent for education increases, educated young people's chances of finding better-paid jobs with social security also get stronger, but youth unemployment rate also rises. Unemployment rate climbs up further especially in the periods of crisis. In the survey conducted in 2009, the number of vocational high school graduates increased, which means that there are more educated and unionized workers in 2009 compared to 2005. In short, the higher is the level of education, the stronger are the chances of job-seeking young people to find jobs in unionized and formal sector jobs.

¹³ According to the UM member identity survey in 2008, the rate of primary school graduates under the age of 25 is 7%, middle school graduates are 9,9%, high school graduates are 73,3% (regular high school graduates make up 8,5% and vocational high school graduates make up 63,4%), and two-year university degree holders are 9,9%. There is no university graduate.

Marital Status

In RE1, %58 of young members are single and 31.4% are married (UM, 2005). In 2008 UM survey, the rate of those who are single under the age of 25 is higher. In the survey of Tarem, 55% of young union members are single and 44% are married. It must be taken into consideration that the age range is wider in Tarem’s survey. 60% of the married ones are newly (1-3 years) married.

Living with Parents

In both surveys, it is seen that young workers mostly live with their parents. There is low rate of those living alone. In RE1, 56,5 percent of United Metal members live with their parents (mother, father and siblings), 29,9 percent live with their spouses and 4,5 percent live alone. %9 percent who answered “Other” usually come from the rural areas and reside in the houses of their brothers or sisters. The rate of those who live with their family or relatives is 86%. According to RE2 survey, the rate of those who live with their family or relatives is 87%. Half of those who live in a household live with 4-5 people. In the RE2 survey conducted during the crisis, there is a slight increase in the rate of living with parents.

Table 8: Whom are you living with now?

RE1- Whom are you living with now?		RE2- Whom are you living with now?	
BASE - Total Respondents	156	BASE - Total Respondents	199
	%		%
Mother, Father, Brother/Sister	56.5	Family/Relative	87
Spouse	29.9	Friend	8
Alone	4.5	Alone	4
Other	9	No answer	2
	100		100

(a)

(b)

Both studies show that more than half of young workers live with their parents and the house they live in belongs to their parents. In RE1, 51,6 percent of the young members live in the house of their parents, 34,2 percent in rented house and 12,3 percent in their own house. In RE2 survey, 56% of young union member workers live in a house belonging to their parents and 34% live in rented house. It is observed that young workers live with their parents or friends due to low wages (UM, 2008:19).

4.2. Working Life

As both surveys are classified by the number of years worked, it is observed that there has been a decline in the number of years worked, especially along with the crisis. In the survey of UM, nearly half of young workers are working for 2 years while in Tarem’s survey conducted during the crisis, only 20 percent of them are working for 2 years. We believe that this indicator shows that the rate of those who started working recently is much less compared to the previous times.

In RE1, majority of United Metal members are new members. 33,1% of young workers are working at their job for 2 years while 18,3 percent are 1-year workers, 13,7 percent are 3-year workers, 9,8 percent are 5-year workers and 12,4 percent are working for

more than 5 years. In RE2, 21% are working insured for 2 years and less, 39% for 2-5 years, 25% for 10 years and 15% for 10 years and more.

Most of United Metal members in RE1 have changed jobs despite their young age. 20,3 percent of United Metal members keep their first jobs while 36,8 percent changed jobs twice and 27,8 percent for three times¹⁴. More than half of United Metal members became unemployed. More than half of them became unemployed for once while 28,8 percent became unemployed twice, 8,2 percent for 3 times, 4,1% for 4 times, 4,1% for 5 times and more. 33,7 percent of United Metal members remained unemployed for 2 to 5 months, 23,4 percent for 6 to 10 months, 23,4 percent for 1 year, 11,7 percent for 2 years and 7,8 percent for 3 years and more. Nearly half of United Metal members expect promotion while the other half does not. The lack of expectation for promotion is an indicator of pessimism.

62,7 percent of United Metal members work overtime. As for the problems in working life, United Metal members mostly complain from low wages, and from employment security at the second place and rising age of retirement at the third place. The rate of those mentioning unemployment as the most important problem reaches 26,5 percent while severance pay reaches 20,5 percent and occupational accidents reach 7,9 percent.

10% of the interviewees work in a second job in RE1 and 6% in RE2. 69,5% of young union members find their wages insufficient in RE1 while 66% of of young union members find their wages from their current jobs insufficient.

Table 9: Sufficiency of Wage

RE1-Can you make a living with your wage?		RE2- Do you think that your wage is sufficient?	
BASE - Total Respondents	156	BASE - Total Respondents	199
	%		%
Yes	30,5	Yes	34
No	69,5	No	66
	100		100

(a)

(b)

Although they find their income insufficient, 92,8 percent of young workers of United Metal members in RE1 expressed their satisfaction with their job. 7,2 percent are not satisfied. Upon the question of what job they would like to do, one fourth of United Metal workers answered as their current job, 19,5 percent as self-employed, 14,5 percent as desk job, 6,1 percent as teacher, and 3,7 percent as manager. According to the survey of Tarem, 74% are satisfied with their job. Out of 21 workers who are not satisfied with their jobs, 57% are considering changing jobs due to low wage and 38% due to heavy working conditions.

¹⁴ In the survey of UM in 2008, the rate of those who work in their first job is 14% in the age group of 25 and under. There is scarcely any in the 26-30 age group. The rate of working in their first job rises gradually in following age groups. This situation may be evaluated as a result of flexibilisation in employment (UM 2008: 39-40).

Table 10: Satisfaction with their job

RE1- Are you satisfied with your job?		RE2- Are you satisfied with your job? Do you think to change your job?	
<hr/>		<hr/>	
BASE - Total Respondents	156	BASE - Total Respondents	199
	%		%
Yes	92,8	Yes, I'm satisfied and I don't think to change it.	74
No	7,2	No, I'm not satisfied but I don't think to change it.	15
	100	No, I'm not satisfied and I think to change it.	11
<hr/>		<hr/>	
(a)		(b)	

4.3. Unionization

RE1 survey only concerns young members of United Metal Workers' Union so all the interviewees are union members. In RE2 survey, 26% of the insured and 18% of all interviewees are union members. In RE2 survey, 17% of those who are union members are members of United Metal Workers' Union while the others are member of different unions in different sectors. However, most of work places in question are not small work places where unionization is low, but medium and large scale enterprises. Union members were thus somewhat over-represented in RE2 sample. If we assume that 13 percent (2008) of the all the employees, including the public sector, are unionized and $\frac{1}{4}$ of them are young workers, we can suppose that 8.3 percent of total young employees are unionized in Turkey (2008)¹⁵.

As for the terms of union membership, the rate of those who are union members for 2 years at most is 70% while this rate declines to 46% in RE2 survey. This indicates that new unionization has not increased sufficiently among young workers due to the crisis. For instance, 2-5 year union membership rate is 21% in RE1 survey while this rate is 37% in RE2 survey. Though it may be thought that the difference occurs from including different age groups, a great majority of union members in RE2 survey are in the 25-29 age group. Therefore, it is understood that unionization of young workers remained at a low level.

In RE1, most of the young members do not have union experience¹⁶. Half of the members did not join a strike before while 13 percent did. Half of the members have been in solidarity with workers in strike or resistance while the other half have not. Yet, it is seen that members have attended certain activities held by the union. 34,3 percent of the members took part in a march, 24,9 percent in a training, 19,3 percent in a protest, and 13,8 percent in May Day demonstration. Only 7,7 percent of the members said they did not join any activity. According to RE1, nearly half of the young members attended union trainings, but 71,8 percent of the members consider union trainings to be insufficient. A great majority of the workers in RE1 stated that they joined union activities, but mostly explained this attendance as going to the union office. Hence, it is understood that almost all of United Metal's young members perceive participation in activities as just visiting the union's office.

¹⁵ See Çelik and Lordođlu (2006) for the calculation of unionization rate.

¹⁶ According to UM's member identity survey in 2008, it is seen that workers do not have any experience in a strike in general (84%). According to this survey, the rate of those who took part in a strike at least once until 2008 is 4.8% under the age of 25. This rate is 9.8% in the 26-30 age group, 10.6% in 31-35 age group, 16,3% in 36-40 age group and 47% in 41 and above age group (UM, 2008).

In RE2 survey, workers mostly (85%) stated that they did not have an active task in the union to which they are affiliated. In RE1, 53,1 percent of young members said they could actively participate in union organization and 46,9 percent said they would not.

Table 11: RE2-What is the main duty of trade unions?

BASE - Total Respondents	199
	%
Protecting the workers' rights	86
Organizing	5
Improving workers Rights	4
Raise awareness	2
Being a bridge between employers and employees	2
Other	5

According to RE2 survey, 86% of young union members stated that the essential duty of unions is to protect the rights of workers. However, almost half (49%) of young union members said that the union could not fulfill this task of protecting workers' rights. %50 of those who said that unions could not protect workers' rights explained this with the oppressive attitude of employers, 42% with legal constraints upon union activities, and 43% with inefficiency of union management.

Table 12: RE2- Why trade unions could not protect and improve workers' rights?

BASE -	98*
	%
Repressive attitude of employers	50
Inefficiency of trade union management	43
Legislative constraints upon union activities	42
Inefficiency or lack of work place representative	34
Insufficient dialogue between employers and trade unions	32
Less-development of Turkey	22
Lack of democracy in trade unions	19
Workers do not support (claim) trade unions adequately	17
Trade unions do not take support from the confederations	13
Economic conjuncture	11
Trade unions and workers lack of enough financial source	10
Other	6
	300

According to RE2 survey, 71% of young union members think that there is obstacle(s) in front of union organization. According to young union members, the primary obstacle is the risk of dismissal (84%). Other reasons include Laws' inability to protect unionized workers (40%), Employers' practices (45%), Subcontracting (35%), Lack of confidence in unions (27%), Unregistered employment (23%), Flexible working practices (18%), and Working in small scale firms (16%).

Table 13: RE2-What are the obstacles in front of the unionization of workers?

BASE -	141
	%
Fear of dismissal	84
Laws can't protect the organized workers	49
Employers' practices	45
Subcontracting	35
Lack of confidence in trade unions	27
Unregistered employment	23
Flexible employment practices	18
Working in small scale firms	16
Other	2
	299

According to RE2 survey, young union members gave the following answers to the question of what unions should do to become more efficient about the solution of workers' problems: Being Together with Workers More (16%), More Active Efforts (10%), Raising Awareness More (8%), More Organizing (8%), Taking Sides with Workers (7%), Determining and Solving Problems (6%).

According to RE1, almost all (97,3%) of the young members stated that they got union publications. According to the RE2 survey, 68% of young union members follow union publications. Yet, the rate of those who follow them regularly is 24%.¹⁷

4.4. Economic Crisis

RE2 survey was conducted during the crisis in 2009. This sub-section of the study compares the answers of unionized and non-unionized young workers in RE2 survey to the questions regarding their perception of the crisis.

Upon a question as "Which group of workers do you think were affected from the economic crisis most severely?", nearly 70% of unionized and non-unionized young workers stated that all workers were affected from the crisis similarly. 22% of non-unionized young workers and 18% of unionized young workers stated that young workers were affected from the crisis more severely (TAREM, 2009). 5% of unionized young workers and 2% of non-unionized young workers stated that female workers were affected from the crisis more severely. 5% of unionized young workers and 1% of non-unionized young workers stated that blue-collar workers were affected from the crisis more severely.

¹⁷ According to UM's member identity survey in 2008, 48% of the members stated that they appreciated union publications.

Table 14: RE2-Which group of workers do you think were affected from the economic crisis most severely?

	TOTAL	members	non-members
BASE - Total Respondents	1108	199	573
	%	%	%
All workers similarly	69	69	70
Young workers	23	18	22
Female workers	3	5	2
Blue-collar workers	3	5	4
White-collar workers	1	2	1
Other	-	3	-
	100	100	100

In RE2 survey, upon a question as “what kind of changes were made in your current workplace after this economic crisis?”, 57% of non-unionized young workers and 37% of unionized young workers answered as “no change”. It is interesting that a high rate of workers as more than half of non-unionized young workers and 37% of unionized young workers stated that there was no crisis-related change in the practices in their workplaces. On the other hand, union members stated that there were dismissions during the crisis (20%), annual paid leaves were applied to earlier dates (19%), salaries were given with delay (18%) and unpaid leaves were applied (17%). Non-unionized workers stated that there were dismissions (17%) and salaries were given with delay (20%).

Table 15: RE2-What kind of changes were made in your current work place after this economic crisis?

	TOTAL	members	non-members
BASE - Total Respondents	1108	199	573
	%	%	%
No change	53	37	57
Firing workers	17	20	17
Annual paid leaves were applied to earlier dates	4	19	1
Late payments	20	18	20
Unpaid leave	8	17	6
Subcontracting implied	2	9	1
Rupture of the collective bargaining agreement	2	8	1
Working hours decreased with wage decrease	4	4	3
Short working benefit/short time work pay	1	4	1
No wage increase	2	4	2
Other	7	11	6
	120	147	114

As for the impact of the current crisis upon workers, 67% of non-unionized young workers and 58% of unionized young workers answered that there had been no change. 15% of unionized workers and 20% of non-unionized workers stated that salaries were given with delay. From the point of unionized workers, it was stated that annual paid leaves were applied to earlier date in common (13%).

Table 16: RE2-How the current crises affect you?

	TOTAL	members	non-members
BASE - Total Respondents	1108	199	573
	%	%	%
No change	64	58	67
Late payment	20	15	20
Annual paid leave were applied to earlier date	3	13	*
Unpaid leave	3	8	3
Short working benefit/short time work pay	1	4	*
No wage increase	2	4	2
Working hours decreased with pay cut	4	3	2
Rupture of the collective bargaining agreement	1	3	1
Firing workers	1	2	*
Working hours decreased without pay cut	1	1	*
Other	4	2	5
	104	110	101

According to RE2 survey, half of both unionized and non-unionized young workers suppose that unions did not carry on effective activities after the economic crisis.

Table 17: RE2-Do you think that trade unions carry on effective activities for the benefit of the workers after the economic crisis?

	TOTAL	members	non-members
BASE - Total Respondents	1108	199	573
	%	%	%
Yes	11	27	7
No	49	49	54
No idea	32	16	31
Undecided	8	9	8
	100	100	100

Again half of unionized young workers stated that the crisis did not cause any change in confidence in unions while 20% stated that confidence was improved and 20% said confidence was decreased. The rate of those who expressed improved confidence among the non-unionized workers is only 2%.

Table 18: RE2-How the economic crises effect your confidence in trade unions?

	TOTAL	members	non-members
BASE - Total Respondents	1108	199	573
	%	%	%
Increased	6	20	2
Did not change	35	53	33
Decreased	19	20	19
No idea, doesn't know	39	8	45
	100	100	100

According to RE2 survey, economic crises led to 66% of non member young workers and 71% of the unionized young workers look more pessimistic to the future.

Table 19: RE2-Did economic crises change your view of future?

	TOTAL	members	non- members
BASE - Total Respondents	1108	199	573
	%	%	%
Yes, I became more pessimistic about the future.	69	71	66
Yes, I became more optimistic about the future.	5	4	6
No change.	25	25	29
	100	100	100

5. Conclusion

The economy of Turkey has been affected from the crises severely in 2008 as the other countries in the world. Decline in foreign trade, shrinking GNP, and most importantly, rising unemployment rates are only a few of the striking impacts of the crisis. Increasing unemployment rates, which is already high, up to 14 percent for 2009 brought along various social problems. This further increase in unemployment rates has been one of the main problems encountered especially by the youth and those who seek jobs for the first time.

This study evaluates the findings of two different surveys conducted with young and unionized workers from the point of labour markets and together with the crisis.

Youth participation in labour force varies among countries and years. LFPR shows a downward trend for youth between 15-29 ages in Turkey. This decline is also in parallel with the decline in employment rates and increase in unemployment rates. Youth LFPR is observed to decline particularly in times of crisis. There is also a gender-based discrimination in LFPR here. Though LFPR decreases for both genders, young men's LFPR is much higher than that of young women.

Youth unemployment rates are above the overall unemployment rates in almost every country. Youth unemployment rates are more than twice as much as overall the unemployment rates in Turkey. In addition to the high rates of unemployment, young workers encounter more serious problems in the labour market compared to adult workers. Unsecured employment, heavy working conditions, and unregular and short-term employment are the most common labour force problems that include the youth mostly.

Other than those who work under the above mentioned conditions, relatively secured and unionized young workers (15-29 age group) are represented in a relatively narrow and limited area in the labour market. In the surveys conducted by unions, only 25-30% of member workers are classified as young workers. If we assume that 13 percent (2008) of the employees, including the public sector, are unionized and $\frac{1}{4}$ of them are young workers, we can suppose that 8.3 percent of total young employees are unionized (2008). We believe that our comparison is meaningful because of the high share of young workers within employment despite being represented at such a low rate in trade unions.

According to compared two surveys, the only relationship that can be established between the age and unionization of young workers is that young workers in the 25-29 age

group are unionized at higher rates. Besides, young workers in this age group demonstrate high levels of education and high rates of employment as well as unionization rates. Young workers' high levels of education as high school and two-year university degree in both surveys can indicate that they have a conscious choice about unionization. However, unionized employment does not turn out to be a common form among the youth. The number of years worked as unionized is low. Especially due to the impact of the crisis, there has been no increase in the number of those who joined the unionized and formal labour market.

The fact that the interviewed young workers do not intend to change their jobs despite their dissatisfaction, mostly concerning low wages, indicates the pressuring influence of the crisis upon the workers.

Although the activities for youth participation in union organization are limited, particularly due to the impact of the crisis, it is understood that young workers adopt unionization. However, unionized young workers do not attend union activities even in their own workplaces, and young workers define unions' inefficiency to protect their basic rights as a confidence-shaking factor. Half of the unionized young workers believe that unions did not carry out effective activities after the economic crisis, either. Besides the lack of confidence in unions, there are other obstacles in front of union organization such as the risk of dismissal, lack of legal protection for unionized workers, pressure of employers, subcontracting, unregistered employment, flexible working practices and employment in small-scale firms.

The general perception of the youth concerning the impact of the crisis is that it affects all workers in the same way. Factors like being unionized or non-unionized or gender differences do not make any difference concerning the impacts of the crisis. Yet, 1/5 of the young workers stated that young workers were affected from the crisis more severely. Unionized young workers stated that there were dismissions, annual paid leaves were applied to earlier dates, salaries were given with delay and unpaid leaves were given during the crisis. As for the impact of the crisis upon them, majority of the young workers stated that there was no change apart from delayed payment of salaries. At this point, it must be taken into consideration that the interviewed young workers are insured and unionized workers who were not dismissed during the crisis. Even though more than half of the workers expressed that they were not affected from the crisis, the economic crises led 71% of the unionized young workers to look more pessimistic to the future.

There are not sufficient numbers of surveys concerning unionized young workers, and in particular, unionized young workers during the crisis. Hence, this study compares two surveys conducted despite certain missing points and problematic aspects in comparison. It is obvious that there is necessity to conduct further studies concerning young workers. We believe that such studies will be meaningful in a period when unionization rates decline, but there are intensified demands for organizing from the base due to the crisis. On the other hand, it is a must to open the way of young workers to take place in unions especially in management in order to ensure youth unionization in the organized struggle of the working class.

References

- Altan Z., D. Kağncıoğlu, Y. Şişman and Z. Sungur (2005), *İşçi Profili Araştırması: Eskişehir Örneği* (Worker Profile Survey: The Case of Eskişehir), Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları, No: 1651, İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Yayınları, No: 190, Eskişehir, (In Turkish).
- Bryson A., R. Gomez, M Gunderson. and N. Meltz (2005), “Youth-Adult Differences in the demand for unionisation: Are American, British and Canadian Workers All that different?”, *Journal of Labor Reserch*, vol. 26(1), pp. 155-167, January.
- Buğra, A., F. Adaman and A. İnsel (2004), *Çalışma Hayatında yeni Gelişmeler ve Türkiye’de Sendikaların Değişen Rolü* (New Developments in Working Life and Changing Role of Trade Unions in Turkey), Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Sosyal Politika Forumu, İstanbul, Mart 2004, http://www.spf.boun.edu.tr/docs/sendika_raporf11.pdf (In Turkish).
- Çelik, A. and K. Lordoğlu (2006), “Türkiye’de Resmî Sendikalaşma İstatistiklerinin sorunları Üstüne” (On the Problems of Official Unionization Statistics in Turkey), *Çalışma ve Toplum Dergisi*, Sayı 9, 2006/2, (In Turkish).
- ÇSGB (Ministry of Labour and Social Security) (2008), *Çalışma Hayatı İstatistikleri* (Labour Statistics), T.C. Çalışma ve Sosyal Güvenlik Bakanlığı, Çalışma Genel Müdürlüğü, yayın no 34, Temmuz 2009, (In Turkish).
- Disk-Ar (1990), “Working class in Turkey in 1990s”, Disk-Ar, İstanbul, (In Turkish).
- Disk-Ar (1993), “Identity of Industrial Workers”, Disk-Ar, İstanbul, (In Turkish).
- ILO (2004), “Genç İstihdamında Küresel Eğilimler” (Tendances Mondiales de l’emploi des Jeunes), çev: İnci Uysal, *Sendikal Notlar*, 24-25, Petrol-İş sendikası yayını, İstanbul, (In Turkish).
- ILO (2010), *Global Employment Trends 2010*, Geneva.
- ILO (2010), *World Labour Report 2010*, Geneva.
- Kristal-İş Union (1990), Glass Industry Workers, Kristal-İş, İstanbul, (In Turkish).
- Kristal-İş Union (1992), Glass Industry Workers Survey-2, Kristal-İş, İstanbul, (In Turkish).
- Martin, G. (2009), “A portrait of the youth labor market in 13 countries, 1980–2007”, *Monthly Labor Review*, July 2009.
- Müftüoğlu Ö. (2001), “Kapitalizmde Dönüşüm Dinamikleri ve Sendikal Kriz” (Transformation Dynamics in Capitalism and Crisis of Trade Unions), in *TMMOB Sanayi Kongresi 2001 Bildiriler Kitabı*, Yayın no. E/2001/291, pp. 263-269, (In Turkish).
- Müftüoğlu Ö. (2007), “Kriz ve Sendikalar” (Crisis and Trade Unions), in F. Sazak (eds), *Türkiye’de Sendikal Kriz ve Sendikal Arayışlar*, Epos Yayınları, Ankara, (In Turkish).
- Özügürlü, M. and A.N. Erten (1999), *Üye Kimlik Araştırması ’99* (Member Identity Survey), Birleşik Metal İşçileri Sendikası, İstanbul, (In Turkish).
- Sazak F. (2007), *Türkiye’de Sendikal Kriz ve Sendikal Arayışlar*, Epos Yayınları, Ankara, (In Turkish).
- Sönmez M. (2010), *Teğet’in yıkımı: Dünyada ve Türkiye’de Küresel Krizin 2009 Enkazı* (Destruction of Tangent: 2009 Detritus of Global Crisis in the World and Turkey), Yordam kitap, İstanbul, (In Turkish).
- TAREM (2009), *Genç İşçi Profili Araştırması* (Young Worker Profile Survey), (In Turkish).
- Toksöz G. and S. Erdoğan (1998), *Sendikacı Kadın Kimliği* (Identity of Female Trade Unionist), (In Turkish).
- TÜRK-İŞ (Unkown), *Örgütlü Genç İşçi Profili Anketi* (Profile of Organized Young Workers Survey), TÜRK-İŞ Gençlik Komitesi, www.turkis.org.tr/source.cms.docs/turkis.org.tr.ce/.../genclikyayin.doc, (In Turkish).
- U.S. Bureau of Labour Statistics (2010), *International Comparisons of Annual Labour Force Statistics*, U.S. Breaou of Labour Statistics Division of International Labour Comparisons, June 2 2010, (<http://www.bls.gov/fls/flscomparelf/lfcompendium.pdf>).
- UM (United Metal Workes’ Union/Birleşik Metal-İş) (2005), *Genç İşçi Anketi* (Young Worker Survey), Unpublished survey, DİSK, Birleşik Metal-İş, İstanbul (In Turkish)
- UM (United Metal Workes’ Union/Birleşik Metal-İş) (2008), *Üye Kimlik Araştırması* (Member Identity Survey), DİSK, Birleşik Metal-İş, İstanbul, (In Turkish).
- UM (United Metal Workes’ Union/Birleşik Metal-İş) (1999) *Üye Kimlik Araştırması 99* (Member Identity Survey 99), DİSK, Birleşik Metal-İş, İstanbul, (In Turkish).
- UM (United Metal Workes’ Union/Birleşik Metal-İş) (1995) *Üye Kimlik Araştırması 95* (Member Identity Survey 95), DİSK, Birleşik Metal-İş, İstanbul, (In Turkish).
- Yentürk, N. and Başlevent, C. (2007), *Gençlik Çalışmaları Birimi Araştırma Raporu* (Youth Studies Department Research Report), no: 2, İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Ekonomi Bölümü, (In Turkish).
- Yücesan Özdemir G. (2010), *Emek ve Teknoloji Türkiye’de Sendikalar ve Yeni İletişim Teknolojileri* (Labour and Technology Trade Unions and New Information Technologies in Turkey), Tan Kitapevi Yayınları, (In Turkish).

<http://www.tuik.gov.tr/>

<http://www.gencsen.org/>

<http://www.gercegacagimerkezi.org/>

<http://www.kotiscileri.org/>

<http://dunyagenciscibusmasi.org/>

Table A1: Unemployment in the world (millions)

	1999	2000	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009*
Total	175.2	173.2	191.0	191.1	184.8	177.7	184.9	211.5
Male	102.0	101.4	110.6	110.2	106.5	102.8	107.1	112.0
Female	73.2	71.8	80.4	80.9	78.4	74.9	77.8	89.5
Youth	73.5	73.1	78.4	79.1	76.0	72.5	74.2	82.7
Adult	101.7	100.2	112.7	112.0	108.8	105.2	110.7	128.8

Source: ILO Global Employment Trends 2010 p:47

Table A2: Unemployment in the world (%)

	1999	2000	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009*
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Male	58.22	58.55	57.91	57.67	57.63	57.85	57.92	52.96
Female	41.78	41.45	42.09	42.33	42.42	42.15	42.08	42.32
Youth	41.95	42.21	41.05	41.39	41.13	40.80	40.13	39.10
Adult	58.05	57.85	59.01	58.61	58.87	59.20	59.87	60.90

Source: ILO Global Employment Trends 2010 p:47

Table A3: Non-institutional population by age group and labour force status

	Non-institutional working age population	Labour Force	Employed	Under employed	Unemployed	Labour force participation rate %	Unemployment rate %	Non-agricultural unemployment rate %	Employment rate %	The ratio of under employed persons to labour force %	Population not in labour force
(15-24) age											
2009*	11,513	4,454	3,328	-	1126	38.7	25.3	29.8	28.9	-	7,059
2008*	11,491	4,381	3,484	157	897	38.1	20.5	24.2	30.3	3.6	7,109
2007*	11,582	4,364	3,492	133	872	37.7	20.0	23.3	30.2	3.0	7,218
2006	12,099	4,589	3,731	186	858	37.9	18.7	22.5	30.8	4.1	7,510
2005	12,177	4,710	3,800	201	910	38.7	19.3	24.2	31.2	4.3	7,467
2004	12,238	4,806	3,862	242	944	39.3	19.6	-	31.6	5.0	7,431
2003	12,379	4,752	3,777	308	975	38.4	20.5	-	30.5	6.5	7,626
2002	12,519	5,116	4,135	332	980	40.9	19.2	-	33.0	6.5	7,404
2001	12,641	5,323	4,460	394	863	42.1	16.2	-	35.3	7.4	7,318
2000	12,703	5,401	4,696	454	705	42.5	13.1	-	37.0	8.4	7,302
(15-29) age											
2009*	17,806	8,487	6,656	-	1,830	47.7	21.6	24.6	37.4	-	9,320
2008*	17,841	8,360	6,938	297	1,422	46.9	17.0	19.4	38.9	3.6	9,481
2007*	17,833	8,224	6,873	264	1,351	46.1	16.4	18.5	38.5	3.2	9,609
2006	18,828	8,777	7,389	385	1,388	46.6	15.8	18.4	39.2	4.4	10,050
2005	18,891	8,916	7,460	384	1,455	47.2	16.3	19.7	39.5	4.3	9,975
2004	18,907	8,963	7,461	462	1,502	47.4	16.8	-	39.5	5.2	9,943
2003	18,971	8,815	7,322	555	1,493	46.5	16.9	-	38.6	6.3	10,155
2002	19,004	9,135	7,675	611	1,458	48.1	16.0	-	40.4	6.7	9,871
2001	18,990	9,199	7,966	690	1,233	48.4	13.4	-	41.9	7.5	9,791
2000	18,887	9,216	8,235	797	981	48.8	10.6	-	43.6	8.6	9,671

Source: Turkstat Turkish Statistical Institute, Labour Force Statistics Database.

*revised version

Table A4: Expanded Unemployment Rate*

Years	Non-institutional working age population (thousand)		Labour Force		Unemployed		Discouraged (thousand)		Available for work but not seeking a job/Other (thousand)		Seasonal worker (thousand)		Underemployed (thousand)		Unemployment rate %		Expanded Unemployment rate %	
	15-24	25-29	15-24	25-29	15-24	25-29	15-24	25-29	15-24	25-29	15-24	25-29	15-24	25-29	15-24	25-29	15-24	25-29
2009	11,513	6,293	4,454	4,033	1,126	704	246	103	364	174	19	9	-	-	25.3	17.5	34.5	22.9
2008	11,491	6,350	4,381	3,979	897	525	221	92	353	180	87	32	157	140	20.5	13.2	33.0	21.9
2007	11,582	6,251	4,364	3,860	872	479	231	93	357	161	78	32	133	131	20.0	12.4	32.4	20.9
2006	12,099	6,729	4,589	4,188	858	530	280	110	430	213	107	45	186	199	18.7	12.7	33.3	23.1
2005	12,177	6,714	4,710	4,206	910	545	240	94	393	168	123	57	201	183	19.3	13.0	32.9	22.2
2004	12,238	6,669	4,806	4,157	944	558	172	61	323	138	113	65	242	220	19.6	13.4	31.7	22.5
2003	12,379	6,592	4,752	4,063	975	518	39	13	98	45	194	116	308	247	20.5	12.7	29.9	20.9
2002	12,519	6,485	5,116	4,019	980	478	35	11	95	47	217	119	332	279	19.2	11.9	28.6	20.9
2001	12,641	6,349	5,323	3,876	863	370	61	15	95	36	237	100	394	296	16.2	9.5	27.0	18.9
2000	12,703	6,184	5,401	3,815	705	276	91	17	139	39	166	107	454	343	13.1	7.2	24.9	18.1

Source: Turkstat, Turkish Statistical Institute, Labour Force Statistics Database.

Note. Expanded Unemployment Rate= (Unemployed+ Discouraged+ Available for work but not seeking a job+ Seasonal worker+ Underemployed)/ (Labour Force+ Discouraged+ Available for work but not seeking a job+ Seasonal worker)*100

Table A5: Non-institutional population and labour force status (15+ age)

	Non-institutional working age population	Labour Force	Employed	Under employed	Unemployed	Labour force participation rate %	Unemployment rate %	Non-agricultural unemployment rate %	Employ ment rate %	The ratio of under employed persons to labour force %	Population not in labour force
2009	51.686	24.748	21.277	-	3.471	47,9	14	17,4	41,2	-	26.938
2008	50.772	23.805	21.194	779	2.611	46,9	11	13,6	41,7	3,3	26.967
2007	49.994	23.114	20.738	689	2.377	46,2	10,3	12,6	41,5	3	26.879
2006	49.174	22.751	20.423	776	2.328	46,3	10,2	12,7	41,5	3,4	26.423
2005	48.358	22.454	20.066	702	2.388	46,4	10,6	13,5	41,5	3,1	25.904
2004	47.544	22.016	19.632	860	2.385	46,3	10,8	-	41,3	3,9	25.527
2003	48.912	23.640	21.147	1143	2.493	48,3	10,5	-	43,2	4,8	25.272
2002	48.041	23.818	21.354	1297	2.464	49,6	10,3	-	44,4	5,4	24.223
2001	47.158	23.491	21.524	1404	1.967	49,8	8,4	-	45,6	6	23.667
2000	46.211	23.078	21.581	1591	1.497	49,9	6,5	-	46,7	6,9	23.133

Source: Turkstat, Turkish Statistical Institute, Labour Force Statistics Database. <http://www.tuik.gov.tr/isgucuapp/isgucu.zul> (11.11.2010)

Note. 2004-2009 revised version (http://www.tuik.gov.tr/isgucuapp/aciklama/aciklama_veri_tabani.htm)

Table A6: Persons not in labour force by reason of being not in labour force (Thousands), 2008

2008	Discoura- ged	Available for work but not seeking a job/Other	Sea- sonal worker	Busy with house- hold chores	Educa- -tion	Retired	Disabled old or ill	Family or personal reasons	Other *	Total
15-19	123	158	42	741	3.003		93	147	163	4.470
20-24	98	195	45	1.186	678		97	214	126	2.639
15-24	221	353	87	1.927	3.680		190	362	289	7.109
25-29	92	180	32	1.537	70	1	97	288	76	2.372
30-34	67	147	32	1.426	5	2	110	216	61	2.066
35-39	63	134	34	1.359	1	7	104	149	46	1.896
40-44	51	111	30	1.272	0	66	111	86	55	1.782
45-49	45	107	31	1.207	0	363	126	52	45	1.975
50-54	33	85	25	1.041		600	161	42	50	2.036
55-59	25	60	18	852		688	176	33	36	1.888
60-64	10	33	13	602		570	333	17	19	1.597
65+	5	29	13	963		1.192	2.006	19	19	4.245
Total	612	1.238	315	12.186	3.757	3.488	3.414	1.262	695	26.967

Source: Turkstat, Turkish Statistical Institute, Labour Force Statistics Database.

Note. Sample size is too small for reliable estimate for figures less than 2000 person.

Persons not seeking a job or who are not available for work because of other reasons. Persons seeking a job but did not use one of the channels for seeking a job in last three months also are covered in "other" topic.

Table A7: Persons not in labour force by reason of being not in labour force (Thousands)

Years	Discouraged	Available for work but not seeking a job/Other	Seasonal worker	Busy with household chores	Education	Disabled, old or ill	Family or personal reasons	Other *	Total
(15-24) age									
2009	246	364	19	1,835	3,872	187	397	140	7,059
2008	221	353	87	1,927	3,680	190	362	289	7,109
2007	231	357	78	2,040	3,607	170	395	341	7,218
2006	280	430	107	2,219	3,511	174	376	414	7,510
2005	240	393	123	2,297	3,320	176	501	417	7,466
2004	172	323	113	2,434	3,211	167	676	335	7,431
2003	39	98	194	2,277	3,365	138	1,248	263	7,626
2002	35	95	217	2,339	3,124	148	1,163	278	7,404
2001	61	95	237	2,519	2,959	141	971	325	7,318
2000	91	139	166	2,627	2,833	127	930	379	7,302
(25-29) age									
2009	103	174	9	1,463	81	105	301	25	2,261
2008	92	180	32	1,537	70	97	288	76	2,372
2007	93	161	32	1,527	68	98	301	111	2,391
2006	110	213	45	1,717	72	105	215	64	2,540
2005	94	168	57	1,799	65	94	177	54	2,508
2004	61	138	65	1,896	62	91	155	43	2,512
2003	13	45	116	1,919	85	70	131	140	2,529
2002	11	47	119	1,885	61	80	108	148	2,467
2001	15	36	100	1,907	60	86	106	146	2,473
2000	17	39	107	1,836	62	63	97	136	2,369
(15-29) age									
2009	349	538	28	3,298	3,953	292	698	165	9,320
2008	313	533	119	3,464	3,750	287	650	365	9,481
2007	324	518	110	3,567	3,675	268	696	452	9,609
2006	390	643	152	3,936	3,583	279	591	478	10,050
2005	334	561	180	4,096	3,385	270	678	471	9,974
2004	233	461	178	4,330	3,273	258	831	378	9,943
2003	52	143	310	4,196	3,450	208	1,379	403	10,155
2002	46	142	336	4,224	3,185	228	1,271	426	9,871
2001	76	131	337	4,426	3,019	227	1,077	471	9,791
2000	108	178	273	4,463	2,895	190	1,027	515	9,671

Source: Turkstat, Turkish Statistical Institute, Labour Force Statistics Database.

Note. Sample size is too small for reliable estimate for figures less than 2000 person.

Persons not seeking a job or who are not available for work because of other reasons. Persons seeking a job but did not use one of the channels for seeking a job in last three months also are covered in "other" topic.

Table A8: Unemployment rates for youth

Year	United States	Canada	Australia	Japan	France	Germany	Italy	Netherlands	Sweden	United Kingdom
1970	11.0	(na)	(na)	2.0	4.9	0.4	10.4	(na)	2.9	(na)
1971	12.7	(na)	(na)	2.1	5.5	0.6	10.3	(na)	5.1	(na)
1972	12.1	(na)	(na)	2.5	5.9	0.7	13.6	(na)	5.8	(na)
1973	10.5	(na)	(na)	2.3	5.8	0.8	13.2	3.8	5.3	(na)
1974	11.9	(na)	(na)	2.4	6.3	2.2	12.0	5.1	4.5	(na)
1975	16.1	(na)	(na)	3.1	(b) 7.9	4.7	13.2	8.2	3.8	(na)
1976	14.7	12.4	(na)	3.2	9.1	4.8	15.2	9.3	3.8	(na)
1977	13.6	13.8	(na)	3.6	10.7	5.0	14.9	8.9	4.5	(na)
1978	12.3	13.9	12.6	3.8	11.2	4.5	15.4	9.6	5.6	(na)
1979	11.8	12.6	13.0	3.7	12.9	3.6	16.0	10.2	5.1	(na)
1980	13.9	12.7	12.5	3.5	14.3	3.7	15.8	11.9	5.1	(na)
1981	14.9	12.6	11.4	4.0	16.9	5.7	17.3	16.8	6.4	(na)
1982	17.8	18.1	13.8	4.3	18.4	8.2	19.4	19.8	7.7	(na)
1983	17.2	19.1	18.3	4.6	19.4	9.6	20.9	(b)20.9	8.1	(na)
1984	13.9	17.2	16.8	4.9	23.6	(b)10.7	21.6	20.8	6.1	19.8
1985	13.6	15.6	15.2	(b) 4.7	24.1	10.0	22.2	17.4	5.9	18.0
1986	13.3	14.5	(b)14.8	5.2	22.3	8.0	(b)25.5	16.8	5.7	18.2
1987	12.2	13.0	14.6	5.0	21.3	7.4	25.8	(b)15.2	(b) 5.3	15.4
1988	11.0	11.2	13.1	4.7	20.1	6.9	24.8	14.1	4.3	12.6
1989	10.9	10.5	10.8	4.4	17.7	5.5	23.9	12.5	4.0	10.1
1990	(b)11.2	12.0	12.6	4.3	17.9	4.6	21.3	11.5	4.6	10.6
1991	13.4	15.4	17.0	4.2	19.0	(b) 5.5	(b)21.2	10.7	8.0	14.3
1992	14.2	16.8	18.8	4.4	20.6	6.4	22.8	(b) 9.7	13.9	16.8
1993	13.4	16.7	18.2	5.1	24.4	7.8	(b)27.8	9.9	23.5	18.0
1994	(b)12.5	(b)14.9	16.5	5.2	25.9	8.5	29.4	10.4	23.8	16.8
1995	12.1	13.9	14.8	5.9	24.2	8.4	30.6	12.9	20.2	15.8
1996	12.0	14.5	15.1	6.4	25.6	9.7	30.6	12.1	21.5	15.4
1997	11.3	15.5	15.7	6.4	26.4	10.6	30.4	9.5	21.1	14.2
1998	10.4	14.6	14.6	7.4	24.2	9.4	30.1	8.2	17.1	13.6
1999	9.9	13.4	13.3	8.7	24.0	(b) 8.8	29.0	7.1	14.6	13.0
2000	9.3	11.7	12.1	8.9	19.1	8.6	27.3	(b) 5.8	12.0	12.5
2001	10.6	11.9	(b)13.5	9.1	17.8	8.4	24.4	4.6	12.0	12.0
2002	12.0	12.8	12.8	9.5	19.0	10.0	23.4	5.1	13.1	12.2
2003	12.4	12.8	12.0	9.6	16.9	10.8	24.0	(b) 6.4	14.0	12.4
2004	11.8	12.4	11.4	9.0	18.5	12.9	23.8	8.0	17.2	12.3
2005	11.3	11.3	10.6	8.1	19.0	(b)15.5	24.2	8.3	(b)22.2	13.0
2006	10.5	10.6	10.0	7.5	20.2	13.8	22.0	6.6	21.1	14.2
2007	10.5	10.1	9.4	7.6	17.9	11.9	20.6	6.0	18.7	14.4
2008	12.8	10.6	8.9	7.0	17.5	10.5	21.5	5.3	19.1	15.1
2009	17.6	14.0	11.6	8.8	21.6	11.2	25.7	6.7	24.6	19.2

(b) Break in series; see [Country notes](#) for more information.

(na) Not available.

NOTE: Youth are defined as 16- to 24-year-olds in the United States, Canada, France, Sweden, and the United Kingdom; and as 15- to 24-year-olds in Australia, Japan, Germany, Italy, and the Netherlands.

Source: U.S. Bureau of Labour Statistics (2010:12) (<http://www.bls.gov/fls/flscomparelf/lfcompendium.pdf>)